UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/800,742	03/16/2004	Aaron Q. Johnson	27683-011	1162	
29315 7590 04/01/2009 MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC			EXAMINER		
ONE FINANCI	-	GOODCHILD, WILLIAM J			
BOSTON, MA 02111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2445	_	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/01/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): All participants (applicant Rep).	Intonsious Summans	10/800,742	00,742 JOHNSON ET AL.	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD (Examiner). (3) Brain Scheller (Applicant Rep). (4) Date of Interview: 24 March 2009. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Herland-Cohen. Agreement with respect to the claims 1) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation. "wherein the web page that the user is accessing and each of the other web pages comprise any web page on the Internet, (Herland discloses the Internet and monitoring the presence of other users on the same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on different web pages on the linement (I. Com. milb.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation (Solven Report of Internet (I. Com. milb.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation (Solven Report of Internet Web pages on the Internet that were pre-defined, such as espin.com. nilo.com. milb.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation (Solven) in the presence of the species of the reserved would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If	Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
(1) WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD (Examiner). (2) Brain Hopkins (Applicant Rep). (4)		WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD	2445	
2) Brain Hopkins (Applicant Rep). (4)	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: f. I. Identification of prior art discussed: Herland-Cohen. Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: f. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation ™wherein the web page that the user is accessing and each of the other web pages comprise any web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on the same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on the same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on the same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on the same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on the same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on the same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on the pages on the internet that were pre-defined, such as espn.com, nfl.com, nfl.com, nfl.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "calculating a virtual distance between a web page that a user is accessing and other web pages accessed by other users". (Cohen teaches a virtual distance via mapping users on several pre-determined web pages, which a user can view for other users with same interest). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.) INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS SIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTE	(1) <u>WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD (Examiner)</u> .	(3) <u>Brain Scheller (Applicar</u>	<u>ıt Rep)</u> .	
Type: a) Telephonic b	(2) <u>Brain Hopkins (Applicant Rep)</u> .	(4)		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Herland-Cohen. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "wherein the web page that the user is accessing and each of the other web pages comprise any web page, Othen discloses the presence of other users on this same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on different web pages on the internet. (Herland discloses the Internet and monitoring the presence of other users on the same web page. Othen discloses the presence over a group of web pages on the Internet that were pre-defined, such as espn.com, nfl.com, mib.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "calculating a virtual distance between a web page that a user is accessing and other web pages, which a user can view for other users with same interest). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filled, APPLICANT IS	Date of Interview: 24 March 2009.			
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Herland-Cohen. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "wherein the web page that the user is accessing and each of the other web pages comprise any web page on the Internet, (Herland discloses the Internet and monitoring the presence of other users on the same web page. Cohen discloses the presence of other users on different web pages out of a group of web pages, which combined would show a presence over a group of web pages on the Internet that were pre-defined, such as espn.com, mfl.com, mfl.com, etc.). 2. Discussed independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "calculating a virtual distance between a web page that a user is accessing and other web pages accessed by other users". (Cohen teaches a virtual distance via mapping users on several pre-determined web pages, which a user can view for other users with same interest). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview equirements on		2)∏ applicant's representative	·)	
Identification of prior art discussed: Herland-Cohen. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "wherein the web page that the user is accessing and each of the other web pages comprise any web page on the Internet. (Herland discloses the Internet and monitoring the presence of other users on the same web page, Cohen discloses the presence of other users on different web pages out of a group of web pages, which combined would show a presence over a group of web pages on the Internet that were pre-defined, such as espn.com, nfl.com, mlb.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "calculating a virtual distance between a web page that a user is accessing and other web pages accessed by other users", (Cohen teaches a virtual distance via mapping users on several pre-determined web pages, which a user can view for other users with same interest). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTERVIEW. Gee MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last	<i>′</i> —	e)⊠ No.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "wherein the web page that the user is accessing and each of the other web pages comprise any web page on the Internet, (Herland discloses the Internet and monitoring the presence of other users on the same web page, Cohen discloses the presence of other users on different web pages out of a group of web pages, which combined would show a presence over a group of web pages on the Internet that were pre-defined, such as espn.com, nfl.com, mlb.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "calculating a virtual distance between a web page that a user is accessing and other web pages accessed by other users". (Cohen teaches a virtual distance via mapping users on several pre-determined web pages, which a user can view for other users with same interest). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "wherein the web page that the user is accessing and each of the other web pages comprise any web page. Other discloses the presence of other users on different web pages out of a group of web pages, which combined would show a presence over a group of web pages on the Internet that were pre-defined, such as espn.com, nfl.com, mlb.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "calculating a virtual distance between a web page that a user is accessing and other web pages accessed by other users". (Cohen teaches a virtual distance via mapping users on several pre-determined web pages, which a user can view for other users with same interest). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THE INTERVIEW See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Herland-Cohen</u> .			
reached, or any other comments: 1. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "wherein the web page that the user is accessing and each of the other web pages comprise any web page on the Internet, (Herland discloses the Internet and monitoring the presence of other users on the same web page, Cohen discloses the presence of other users on different web pages out of a group of web pages, which combined would show a presence over a group of web pages on the Internet that were pre-defined, such as espn.com, nilb.com etc.) 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examiners reasons and point of view regarding the limitation "calculating a virtual distance between a web page that a user is accessing and other web pages accessed by other users". (Cohen teaches a virtual distance via mapping users on several pre-determined web pages, which a user can view for other users with same interest). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)∏ was not reached. h)⊠ N	I/A.	
/Patrice winder/	reached, or any other comments: 1. Discussed Independer view regarding the limitation "wherein the web page that the comprise any web page on the Internet, (Herland discloses on the same web page, Cohen discloses the presence of opages, which combined would show a presence over a grosuch as espn.com, nfl.com, mlb.com etc.). 2. Discussed Independent claims and explained the examine "calculating a virtual distance between a web page that a unusers", (Cohen teaches a virtual distance via mapping user view for other users with same interest). (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ANTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW.	nt claims and explained the explained the explained is accessing and each is the Internet and monitoring the other users on different web particles and point of view is accessing and other were son several pre-determined with the examiner agroup of the amendments that will be compared to the compared	aminers reasons of the other web the presence of or	s and point of pages ther users up of web defined. mitation ed by other h a user can er the claims claims DF THE LICANT IS THIS LATER, TO

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by
 attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does
 not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner.
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

.